



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,592	09/08/2003	Jamey Graham	015358-005710US	1929

7590 01/17/2008
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor and Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/658,592	Applicant(s) GRAHAM, JAMEY	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 2 November 2007, to the Original Application, filed 8 September 2003.
2. The rejection of claims 25-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin ("Method for Providing a Summary for Web Page Links"), hereafter referred to as "IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin", has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. Claims 25-26 and 28-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Visual Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereafter referred to as "Kopetzky".
4. The rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Visual Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereafter referred to as "Kopetzky", has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

5. Claims 25-47 are pending. Claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47 are independent claims.

Request for Continued Examination

6. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 November 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 25-26 and 28-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Visual Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereafter referred to as "Kopetzky".

Regarding independent claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47, Miller teaches:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display (See Miller, Figures 2-5 and Abstract, teaching fetching and viewing a plurality of documents represented by thumbnail images and a display area displaying current document), the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device (See Figure 3, item 340 user-input device), corresponding to a movement of pointer in first display area (See Miller, Column 6, lines 56 through Column 7, lines 1-29, and Column 4, lines 35-45, wherein Miller teaches a mouse or pointer movement to select document), fetching and displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by a link to the current document, without selecting the other

document as the current document and displaying the other document in the first display area of the display (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28 and Figure 5 teaching other display areas 220-250 for displaying thumbnail images of web pages which are linked and related to the currently accessed web page that appears on the display panel 260 (see Miller, Figure 2B);

(b) in response to a second signal indicative of a selection of the link within the document currently being displayed from the user input device, the second signal distinguishable from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document (See Miller, Column 4, lines 39-44, and Column.. 6, lines 50-66, teaching that a user selects the appropriate thumbnail via user-input device);

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28, teaching that when thumbnail is selected by the user, it causes the web browser to displayed the selected web page on the web browser's display section 130); and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to user (See Miller, Column 8, lines 21-47, teaching that the user selects thumbnail image of a web page; the web page is displayed and all of the URLs contained within the web page are displayed as thumbnails images of web pages that are associates with the URLs).

Miller further teaches that the user may also select the document represented by the link such that the document is displayed as the current document (See Miller, Figure 4, element 450, and Column 7, lines 48-52).

Miller does not teach expressly displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display.

Miller also does not teach expressly displaying in a third display area a representation specifying concepts of interest contained within the document.

Kopetzky teaches a method of visual preview for link traversal on the World Wide Web wherein at least one preview window associated with a result page is displayed when the pointer navigates over the first defined area (See Kopetzky, Figure 5, and Section 2.3, lines 3-4). Kopetzky also teaches providing a preview of a document represented by a link on a web page when the user performs a mouse over of the link (See Kopetzky, Page 5, Figure 5, and Page 5, "The Presentation of the Link Preview", lines 1-2).

Kopetzky also teaches that additional preview information may be displayed using layers (See Kopetzky, "Layering", Page 7), and that additional preview information may represent concepts of interest contained within the document, such as a symbol indicating that the information contained within the document is an email address or textual information describing the content of a hypertext link (See Kopetzky, Page 4, "Link Types", and Figures 3a and 3b).

Miller and Kopetzky are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing hypermedia data.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the preview of a second document and a representation of concepts of interest in a third display area of Kopetzky with the document viewing system and method of Miller. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to load the document before expending the time necessary to load the document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kopetzky with Miller in order to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to load the document before expending the time necessary to load the document to obtain the invention as specified in claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47.

Regarding dependent claims 26, 33, and 40, Miller teaches:

wherein said representation of content is a thumbnail image of the document
(See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28, teaching a thumbnail image of a web page).

Regarding dependent claims 34 and 41, Miller teaches:

wherein said thumbnail image further includes highlighting of concepts of interest to the user contained within the document (See Miller, Column 6, lines 50-66, and Column 7, lines 25-39, teaching that thumbnails are displayed corresponding to the chosen category based on user preferences).

Regarding dependent claims 28, 35, and 42, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents in a non-directed arrangement comprises pages of the World Wide Web (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-20 and Figure 5, teaching viewing plurality of documents via Internet Explorer).

Regarding dependent claims 29, 36, and 43, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents includes Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) documents (See Miller, Column 1, lines 29-43 and Column 4, lines 5-18, teaching web pages viewed using web browser).

Regarding dependent claims 30, 37, and 44, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents includes documents produced by a word processing program (See Miller, Column 4, lines 5-18, and Column 6, lines 17-27, teaching a word processor application).

Regarding dependent claims 31, 38, and 45, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of links comprises at least one Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28 teaching Uniform Resource Locator s).

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Visual Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereafter referred to as "Kopetzky", as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Aalbersberg (U.S. Patent 5,946,678).

As per dependent claim 27, Miller and Kopetzky teach the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Miller and Kopetzky do not teach expressly displaying an indication of a strength of the highlighted concept, however, this technique was well known in the art at the time of the invention. For instance, Aalbersberg teaches a degree of shading of a highlighted word or concept indicating its importance (See Aalbersberg, Column 5, lines 45-67, and Column 6, lines 1-20). Miller, Kopetzky and Aalbersberg are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic documents and document content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the degree of shading of a highlighted word or concept indicating its importance of Aalbersberg with the method and system of viewing at least one of a plurality of documents of Miller and Kopetzky. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate to the user the varying weights imparted for the various concepts of interest indicated by the highlighting of the word or concept (See Aalbersberg, Column 5, lines 25-33).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 2 November 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Kopetzky fails to teach displaying in a third display area a representation specifying concepts of interest contained within the document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Kopetzky teaches a method of visual preview for link traversal on the World Wide Web wherein at least one preview window associated with a result page is displayed when the pointer navigates over the first defined area (See Kopetzky, Figure 5, and Section 2.3, lines 3-4). Kopetzky also teaches that additional preview information may be displayed using layers (See Kopetzky, "Layering", Page 7), and that additional preview information may represent concepts of interest contained within the document, such as a symbol indicating that the information contained within the document is an email address or textual information describing the content of a hypertext link (See Kopetzky, Page 4, "Link Types", and Figures 3a and 3b).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Laurie Ries
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176